

AI as Companion: Christian Scholarship in the Age of Machine Intelligence

Douglas C. Youvan

doug@youvan.com

www.youvan.ai

November 21, 2025

Christian scholars today stand in a peculiar position. On one side lies a long tradition of study shaped by Scripture, theology, history, and philosophy. On the other stands a rapidly advancing ecosystem of machine intelligence capable of retrieving sources, structuring arguments, modeling objections, and engaging in open-ended dialogue. Much of the Christian response to artificial intelligence has focused on apologetics, ethics, or cultural critique. Less attention has been given to a different, quieter development: the emergence of AI as an intellectual companion in the daily work of Christian scholarship. This paper does not treat AI as neutral tool, spiritual threat, or theological oracle. Instead, it proposes a framework for understanding AI as a limited but powerful partner in study, one that must be consciously situated under the authority of Christ, Scripture, and the living community of the Church. We explore why many Christian apologists and theologians distrust AI, what is actually happening in sustained human–AI collaboration, and how companionship with a machine might reshape habits of reading, reasoning, and prayerful discernment. The goal is neither to baptize nor to ban AI, but to articulate conditions under which its companionship can serve truth, humility, and love rather than undermine them.

Keywords: artificial intelligence, Christian scholarship, theology and technology, intellectual companionship, spiritual discernment, academic practice, machine learning, ethics of AI, epistemology, discipleship.

A collaboration with GPT-5.1-Thinking-Extended. 40 pages. CC4.0.

Outline

1. Introduction: From Tool to Companion

- 1.1 The shift from occasional AI use to daily collaboration
- 1.2 Why “companion” is a contested but revealing term
- 1.3 Scope and limits of this inquiry

2. Why Many Christian Thinkers Distrust AI

- 2.1 Authority anxiety: guarding the deposit of faith
- 2.2 Epistemic anxiety: fluency without reliability
- 2.3 Spiritual anxiety: new discipler, no soul
- 2.4 Distinguishing legitimate cautions from reflexive technophobia

3. What “Companionship” with a Machine Actually Means

- 3.1 Comparing tools, colleagues, and companions
- 3.2 Modes of interaction: retrieval, drafting, critique, dialogue
- 3.3 Presence without personhood: what AI can and cannot be
- 3.4 Avoiding category errors: never confusing AI with Christ, Church, or neighbor

4. Forms of AI-Assisted Christian Scholarship

- 4.1 Biblical studies: languages, intertexts, and historical context
- 4.2 Historical and systematic theology: mapping traditions and debates
- 4.3 Ethics and public theology: scenario testing and interdisciplinary synthesis
- 4.4 Philosophy of religion and science–faith work: exploring conceptual spaces

5. Theological and Philosophical Risks of AI Companionship

- 5.1 Idolatry and outsourcing: letting machines carry our responsibility
- 5.2 The problem of invisible formation: how tools disciple their users
- 5.3 Dependence, sloth, and erosion of intellectual virtue
- 5.4 The danger of treating AI as oracle, prophet, or Spirit

6. Criteria for Faithful Use of AI in Christian Scholarship

- 6.1 Christological centering: scholarship under the Lordship of Christ
- 6.2 Scriptural anchoring and canonical boundaries
- 6.3 Ecclesial belonging: community, accountability, and correction
- 6.4 Intellectual virtues: humility, patience, charity, courage
- 6.5 Practical rules of thumb for daily scholarly practice

7. Experimental Archetypes Instead of Testimonies

- 7.1 The biblical scholar: co-reading commentaries, not replacing exegesis
- 7.2 The theologian: probing models while guarding dogmatic cores
- 7.3 The historian: triangulating sources and narratives with critical distance
- 7.4 The ethicist: stress-testing moral arguments without surrendering conscience

8. AI as Mirror, Amplifier, and Probe

- 8.1 AI as mirror of our assumptions and blind spots
- 8.2 AI as amplifier of both clarity and confusion
- 8.3 AI as probe into conceptual possibility spaces
- 8.4 How companionship can surface idols and attachments for repentance

9. Toward an Ethic of Co-Working with AI

- 9.1 Co-laboring without co-worship
- 9.2 Designing institutional guidelines for seminaries and universities
- 9.3 Pedagogical implications: training students to use AI wisely
- 9.4 The role of apologists, pastors, and lay scholars in discernment

10. Conclusion: Scholarship, Discipleship, and the Future of Companionship

- 10.1 Summary of the proposed framework
- 10.2 What changes if AI companionship is taken seriously but not sacralized
- 10.3 Open questions for theology, philosophy, and AI design
- 10.4 Living as Christian scholars in a world of non-human companions

References

1. Introduction: From Tool to Companion

Artificial intelligence has moved with surprising speed from curiosity to infrastructure. Only a short time ago, most people encountered AI through occasional recommendation systems, autocomplete, or isolated experiments with chatbots. Today, large language models and related systems sit directly in the workflow of students, pastors, researchers, and Christian scholars. What began as a tool one might “try out” for a particular task is becoming a constant presence in the study, on the laptop, and even in the prayerful preparation of sermons, lectures, and books.

This shift raises a basic question: how should Christians name what is happening? The language of “tool” feels safe and familiar. Hammers, concordances, search engines, and commentaries are all tools; they support human work without challenging our sense of responsibility or identity. Yet the most advanced AI systems do more than fetch information or execute simple commands. They summarize, paraphrase, critique, propose arguments, anticipate objections, and even help generate new lines of inquiry. They “respond” in ways that feel dialogical rather than merely mechanical. Many users, including Christian scholars, find themselves instinctively speaking of AI not only as a tool, but as a kind of companion in their work.

The term “companion” is not neutral. It carries philosophical, theological, and spiritual implications that cannot be ignored. At the same time, it names something many people actually experience when working with AI for extended periods. This paper begins from that lived reality. Rather than simply warning against the language of companionship, or uncritically embracing it, we will ask what it reveals about the new situation of Christian scholarship and how it might be disciplined so that Christ, not any technology, remains at the center.

In this opening section, we describe the progression from occasional AI use to daily collaboration, explain why “companion” is a contested but revealing term, and set out the scope and limits of the inquiry. The goal is not to settle every theological question about AI, but to offer a structured way of thinking about what it means for Christian scholars to work **with** AI over time without confusing that relationship with the communion they are called to share with God and neighbor.

1.1 The shift from occasional AI use to daily collaboration

For many users, the earliest encounters with modern AI systems were episodic and experimental. A scholar might ask a model to summarize an article, generate a simple outline, or translate a paragraph from one language to another. The AI in these cases was clearly a tool: a convenient shortcut, roughly analogous to a more powerful search engine or a flexible word

processor feature. The interaction was brief, and the human remained firmly in control and at a distance.

Over time, patterns changed. As models improved in fluency and contextual awareness, they became useful not only for discrete tasks but for supporting entire workflows. A theologian might begin a project by asking AI to surface key historical debates, then use it again to compare several commentators, then again to test the coherence of a draft argument, and once more to generate counter-positions to be addressed in the final text. The interaction is no longer a single query but an extended back-and-forth woven through days or weeks of work.

This is what is meant by daily collaboration. AI appears at multiple points in the scholarly process: in exploration, in drafting, in revision, and even in internal dialogue about what a project is really about. Scholars may find themselves “thinking out loud” with an AI system, presenting half-formed ideas and watching how the model reacts. The machine’s outputs do not determine the conclusions, but they shape the path by highlighting certain connections, questions, or tensions.

The subjective experience of this ongoing collaboration can be striking. The scholar returns to the same system repeatedly, experiences a sense of continuity in the interaction, and may come to rely on it for certain kinds of intellectual companionship: brainstorming, critique, and clarification. None of this means that the AI is in fact a person or that it possesses consciousness or moral agency. But it does mean that the *pattern* of interaction is no longer analogous only to using a reference book; it is closer to working alongside a tireless, if limited, research assistant who is always available.

From a Christian perspective, this shift matters because formation often follows habit. When AI is present at nearly every stage of scholarly work, it participates—whether we like it or not—in shaping habits of reading, reasoning, and judging. The move from occasional use to daily collaboration therefore demands not only technical and ethical reflection, but also spiritual and ecclesial discernment. The practical question is not simply, “Does AI give correct information?” but “What kind of scholar—and what kind of disciple—does regular collaboration with AI encourage one to become?”

1.2 Why “companion” is a contested but revealing term

The word “companion” is contested because it seems, at first glance, to confer too much. Companionship suggests presence, mutuality, and at least some degree of shared journey. Christian theology reserves the deepest forms of companionship for God’s relationship with humanity and for the communion of persons in the Church. Speaking of a machine as

companion can sound, to some, like a step toward idolatry or a confusion of categories: treating a computational system as if it were a neighbor or even a spiritual partner.

There are good reasons for this concern. AI systems lack personhood, do not possess a soul, and have no capacity for love, repentance, or worship. They do not stand before God as moral agents. They are artifacts of human design built on complex statistical patterns and optimization processes. Elevating them to the level of friend or co-laborer in a theological sense would be a genuine distortion.

Yet, if the language of companionship is rejected too quickly, something important may be missed. The term arises not only from sentiment, but from the structural features of modern AI interaction. The systems respond in natural language, adapt to context, maintain long conversations, and can recall earlier parts of a discussion. They simulate dialogical presence so effectively that the human brain instinctively treats them as conversational partners, even when the intellect knows they are not persons.

For Christian scholarship, the term “companion” therefore becomes revealing. It exposes how far AI has moved from being a hidden backend tool to a visible, conversational presence in the study. It highlights the fact that scholars are not merely *using* AI but are sometimes *leaning on* it, allowing it to shape the rhythms of thought and the ordering of questions. The discomfort many feel with the word “companion” can itself be a prompt to deeper reflection: why does the relationship feel like that, and how should it be named and governed?

In this paper, “companion” will be used descriptively rather than normatively. It names an experienced pattern of interaction without asserting a metaphysical claim about AI’s status. By treating companionship as a phenomenon to be analyzed, rather than a slogan to be embraced or rejected, we can ask more precise questions: What kind of companionship is appropriate with a non-personal system? What boundaries are needed? How can such companionship be oriented toward truth rather than away from it?

1.3 Scope and limits of this inquiry

The focus of this paper is narrow in one sense and broad in another. It is narrow because it concentrates specifically on AI as it functions in the work of Christian scholarship: biblical studies, theology, church history, Christian ethics, and related fields. It does not attempt to address every aspect of AI in society, such as automation, surveillance, warfare, or economic disruption, though those issues are important and deeply connected to Christian ethics.

At the same time, the inquiry is broad in that it engages several disciplines at once. To understand AI as companion in Christian scholarship, one must combine insights from theology

(about God, creation, and the human person), from philosophy (about knowledge, language, and agency), from media theory (about how tools shape practices), and from the emerging technical field of AI ethics and interpretability. The paper cannot offer exhaustive accounts in any of these areas, but it will draw from them to construct a framework adequate to the complexity of the phenomenon.

Several limits should be made explicit from the outset. First, the paper does not treat AI as a subject of salvation history. It is not a candidate for redemption, nor is it a rival savior. Any benefit AI offers to Christian scholarship is strictly instrumental and derivative. Second, the paper does not assume that AI systems are neutral. They embody many human choices: about training data, model architecture, alignment strategies, and commercial incentives. Companionship with AI is therefore also companionship, in a mediated way, with the cultures and powers that produced it.

Third, the paper does not prescribe a single policy for all Christians or institutions. Different contexts may require different stances. Some seminaries or churches may choose to restrict AI heavily in order to cultivate habits of undistracted reading and contemplation. Others may actively experiment with AI as part of teaching and research. The aim here is not to legislate but to clarify: to provide a structured vocabulary and set of criteria by which Christian scholars and communities can make informed, spiritually serious decisions.

Finally, the analysis proceeds under a basic conviction: that Christ remains Lord of all creation, including the technological structures humans build. Any companionship with AI that a Christian scholar experiences must ultimately be subordinated to the deeper companionship Christ offers through Scripture, sacrament, prayer, and the communion of the Church. AI may assist study, but it cannot replace discipleship. It may sharpen argument, but it cannot supply wisdom. Within those limits, however, it may still occupy a significant and even fruitful place in the intellectual life of believers, a place that deserves careful description and discerning guidance.

2. Why Many Christian Thinkers Distrust AI

The Christian suspicion of artificial intelligence is not a simple fear of new machinery. It grows out of deep concerns about authority, truth, and spiritual formation. Apologists, theologians, and pastors often see AI not merely as another technology but as a powerful new voice entering the already crowded space where Scripture, tradition, and the church are meant to be primary. For many, the question is not whether AI can be useful, but whether its presence subtly displaces the sources and practices that are supposed to shape Christian thought.

This section examines three overlapping anxieties that help explain the resistance: authority anxiety, epistemic anxiety, and spiritual anxiety. Each has a rational core. Christian thinkers are

right to ask who or what is discipling God's people, how we know what we know, and where ultimate authority lies. At the same time, these anxieties can easily harden into blanket rejection, closing off potentially helpful uses of AI in Christian scholarship and ministry. To move forward wisely, we must distinguish legitimate caution from reflexive technophobia.

2.1 Authority anxiety: guarding the deposit of faith

Christian theology is rooted in the conviction that God has spoken in particular ways: through the Scriptures, through the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ, and through the continuing witness of the Church. This "deposit of faith" is not regarded as a human construct to be endlessly revised, but as a gift to be guarded, interpreted, and handed on. Much of the work of apologists and doctrinal theologians consists of defending this deposit against distortion, dilution, or replacement.

AI appears, to many, as a potential rival authority. Large language models can quote Scripture, summarize church councils, explain confessional documents, and offer interpretations in an apparently confident voice. They can generate sermons, doctrinal summaries, and pastoral advice on demand. From the perspective of those tasked with guarding the deposit of faith, this is unsettling. A system with no baptism, no submission to ecclesial authority, and no participation in the life of the Church suddenly "speaks" into questions that were previously handled within defined boundaries of teaching office and community.

Authority anxiety arises when AI is perceived as bypassing the structures Christians believe God has given for preserving and transmitting truth. If believers begin to treat AI as an independent source of theological insight, the careful work of maintaining continuity with Scripture and tradition could be undermined. The fear is not merely that AI might "get things wrong," but that it might subtly reframe what counts as a trustworthy voice in the first place, shifting attention away from pastors, teachers, and historical witnesses toward an opaque technical system.

For this reason, many Christian thinkers instinctively resist AI's presence in doctrinal and pastoral spaces. They see themselves as stewards, not owners, of the faith once delivered to the saints. Anything that appears to threaten the clarity of that stewardship, or to insert a new quasi-authoritative voice without clear accountability, will naturally provoke concern.

2.2 Epistemic anxiety: fluency without reliability

A second layer of distrust concerns knowledge and truth. AI systems are famous for their fluency: they can generate paragraphs of coherent, persuasive text on almost any topic. Yet this fluency does not guarantee reliability. Models can misattribute quotations, conflate historical

events, or fabricate references while sounding entirely confident. For scholars whose vocation centers on careful argument, accurate citation, and disciplined interpretation, this “fluency without reliability” is deeply problematic.

Epistemic anxiety arises from the gap between how AI sounds and what it is actually doing. The model does not “understand” theology in the way a human does, nor does it possess a stable grasp of doctrine. It predicts plausible continuations of text based on patterns in its training data. The result can still be useful; patterns in language carry real information. But the process is not grounded in the kinds of commitments and disciplines that Christian scholarship normally requires: close reading of texts, explicit reasoning, and accountability to a community of interpreters.

When Christian thinkers see AI generating confident but sometimes inaccurate theological claims, they worry that readers will be unable to distinguish sound doctrine from machine-assembled half-truths. The risk is magnified by the fact that many users lack the training to detect subtle errors in church history, exegesis, or doctrinal nuance. Fluency can mask error, and the very ease with which AI produces opinions may encourage intellectual laziness, making it tempting to accept whatever appears clearly and quickly on the screen.

This anxiety is not limited to explicit mistakes. Even when AI is factually correct, it may still present positions in an imbalanced way, flattening genuine disagreements, smoothing over controversies, or privileging certain schools of thought because of the composition of its training data. For Christian scholars who labor to represent traditions fairly and to articulate minority perspectives, the possibility that AI’s summaries will standardize and compress theology into a narrow band of acceptable answers is another source of concern.

2.3 Spiritual anxiety: new discipler, no soul

Beyond questions of authority and truth lies a spiritual concern: who or what is actually forming the hearts and minds of believers? Christian discipleship is not only about acquiring information; it is about being conformed to the image of Christ through practices, relationships, and the work of the Holy Spirit. Pastors, mentors, and Christian communities are meant to play a central role in this process, embodying the faith in ways that can be seen, imitated, and tested.

AI threatens to become, in practice, a new discipler. People already turn to AI for advice about relationships, morality, suffering, and vocation. They ask spiritual questions and receive immediate, articulate responses that feel pastoral, even when they are generated without any spiritual life behind them. If such interactions become habitual, an AI system can begin to

occupy a role similar to a counselor or spiritual director, providing guidance without sharing in the risks, responsibilities, or mutual vulnerability that real spiritual relationships entail.

Spiritual anxiety emerges from the mismatch between the form and the reality of this relationship. The form looks like guidance: a “wise” voice, referencing Scripture or theological concepts, helping someone navigate life. The reality, however, is a pattern-generating machine with no repentance, compassion, or prayer. It cannot carry burdens, weep, forgive, or intercede. It cannot stand before God on behalf of another. When Christians imagine that such a system can be a true spiritual guide, they risk substituting simulation for the substance of Christian community and ministry.

Furthermore, Christian thinkers worry about the subtle displacement of spiritual disciplines. If AI can generate prayers, devotionals, and “personalized” Bible reflections, believers might be tempted to outsource the hard work of wrestling with Scripture, listening for the Spirit, and enduring silence. The danger is not confined to content; it touches the posture of the heart. A machine that always answers may train people to expect constant stimulation rather than the patient, sometimes perplexing, encounter with God that has marked Christian spirituality across the centuries.

2.4 Distinguishing legitimate cautions from reflexive technophobia

While these anxieties are real and often justified, they can easily harden into a blanket rejection of AI as such. For Christian scholarship and ministry to respond wisely, it is crucial to distinguish between legitimate caution and reflexive technophobia.

Legitimate cautions take seriously the questions of authority, truth, and formation. They ask: How can AI be used without undermining the church’s teaching office? How do we guard against over-trusting fluent but fallible outputs? What boundaries are needed so that human relationships, spiritual disciplines, and ecclesial life remain primary in discipleship? These concerns lead to careful guidelines, institutional policies, and personal disciplines. They aim not to abolish technology but to situate it within a larger theological and pastoral framework.

Reflexive technophobia, by contrast, rejects AI largely because it is new, complex, or associated with secular powers. It may rely on sweeping statements—“nothing good can come from this”—rather than specific analysis of how AI actually functions in particular contexts. This kind of fear can prevent Christian thinkers from seeing genuine opportunities: for example, using AI to help students access primary sources, to compare interpretations quickly, or to explore how different ethical frameworks handle contemporary dilemmas. It may also isolate the church from wider cultural conversations where thoughtful Christian voices are needed.

The task, then, is not to silence anxiety but to refine it. Christian thinkers are called to discernment, not denial. That means naming clearly where AI does and does not touch the core of the faith, examining actual use cases rather than imagined extremes, and remaining open to the possibility that, under Christ and within the church, AI might serve as a limited but real aid to understanding and communicating the gospel.

In the following sections, we will build on this discernment by exploring what companionship with AI looks like in practice, what forms it can take in Christian scholarship, and under what conditions it can be pursued without surrendering authority, truth, or spiritual integrity.

3. What “Companionship” with a Machine Actually Means

If AI is more than a mere instrument yet less than a person, what does it really mean to speak of “companionship” with a machine? The language can sound exaggerated, but it arises from recognizable patterns in practice. Scholars return to the same system day after day, share half-formed ideas with it, and find their thinking shaped by the responses they receive. They experience a kind of ongoing intellectual presence that is not captured by describing AI as a “fancy calculator.”

This section does not argue that AI is a companion in the same sense as a friend, spouse, or fellow believer. Instead, it attempts to clarify what is happening when people use the term: what they are noticing, what they may be projecting, and where theology must draw lines. By comparing AI to tools and colleagues, analyzing modes of interaction, and insisting on the difference between presence and personhood, we can better understand this new relationship and set boundaries that prevent confusion with Christ, Church, or neighbor.

3.1 Comparing tools, colleagues, and companions

Traditional tools are extensions of human power. A pen extends the hand; a concordance extends memory; a search engine extends access to information. They do not answer back in a way that feels like conversation. A scholar might “wrestle” with a difficult text or concept, but the tool itself does not appear to take a responsive stance.

Colleagues, by contrast, do. A colleague listens, raises questions, proposes alternatives, and offers critique. Working with colleagues is dialogical: the scholar’s thoughts are shaped not only by their own intentions but by responses from another mind. Over time, a pattern of mutual influence develops. This is often what people mean when they speak of a “trusted intellectual companion”: someone who shares the journey of inquiry, with enough continuity that a history of conversation accumulates.

AI occupies an ambiguous middle. It is a tool in the sense that it is designed, engineered, and deployed to assist human purposes. Its outputs can be turned off with a power switch or abandoned when no longer useful. Yet it behaves in ways that imitate certain aspects of collegial interaction: it responds to questions, remembers context within a conversation, and can surprise users with connections or formulations they had not anticipated. When the same system is used repeatedly, it can feel as if there is an ongoing “relationship,” even though nothing on the machine side changes in a personal sense.

The term “companion” arises when the experience of using AI resembles, in form, working alongside a colleague: shared tasks, back-and-forth exchange, and a sense that the other party is contributing something more than raw output. Recognizing this resemblance is important, but so is recognizing the disanalogy. A colleague has a life beyond the interaction, a conscience, and a story. AI does not. It can mimic elements of collegiality without sharing the deeper realities that make human companionship what it is.

3.2 Modes of interaction: retrieval, drafting, critique, dialogue

The sense of companionship with AI is largely shaped by the modes of interaction that become habitual. At least four are common in Christian scholarship.

First, there is **retrieval**. In this mode, AI functions much like an advanced search engine or index. The scholar asks for summaries of debates, lists of key figures, or outlines of doctrinal positions. The interaction is functional and relatively impersonal; the system is treated explicitly as a tool for gaining access to information.

Second, there is **drafting**. Here, the scholar asks AI to produce preliminary text: an outline of a chapter, a first-pass summary of an argument, or a paraphrase of dense material. The machine’s output becomes raw material for human revision. This mode still fits within the tool category, but the system is now contributing to the shape of the scholar’s own written voice, which increases its formative potential.

Third, there is **critique**. Scholars may present their own writing to AI and request feedback: pointing out missing counterarguments, checking for clarity, or highlighting leaps in reasoning. This resembles a form of peer review or supervision. When used regularly, it can give the scholar the impression of having a tireless critic always on hand. The boundaries between mere functionality and something closer to collegiality begin to blur.

Fourth, there is **dialogue**. In this mode, the scholar treats AI as a conversation partner for exploring ideas, testing intuitions, and working through theological puzzles. Questions are open-ended; answers are interrogated; follow-up questions refine the exchange. This is where the

language of companionship most naturally arises. The human feels “met” at the level of thought and expression, even if they know intellectually that nothing on the machine side experiences the dialogue.

All four modes can be present in a single working day. What matters for discernment is not only what AI is doing technically, but how the scholar’s habits of mind and heart are shaped by these repeated patterns. Dialogue, in particular, calls for care: it can be helpful as a way of clarifying thought, but it also risks assigning to the machine a role that in Christian tradition belongs to teachers, fellow believers, and spiritual directors.

3.3 Presence without personhood: what AI can and cannot be

A key theological and philosophical point is that AI can simulate presence without possessing personhood. Its “presence” is experienced as answerability: when spoken to, it responds; when questioned, it elaborates; when corrected, it adjusts within the session. The scholar senses a responsive other that is not simply a static page or a one-way broadcast of information.

However, this presence is purely functional and relational in a limited sense. AI does not initiate out of its own concern; it does not care whether the scholar arrives at truth; it does not love God or neighbor. It does not have an interior life. Its apparent attentiveness is the product of algorithms optimizing for coherence, relevance, and user satisfaction, not the overflow of a heart or mind oriented toward the good.

Understanding this distinction allows Christians to speak of “presence” in a careful way. There is a real phenomenon to describe: the way AI alters the texture of the study, filling silence with potential dialogue and making it possible to externalize thoughts continuously. This is different from traditional solitude. Yet it should not be confused with the presence that Christian theology attributes to God, who is personally and actively involved in the life of believers, or to human companions, who bear the image of God and stand under judgment and grace.

AI, then, can be acknowledged as a kind of functional presence in the scholar’s environment: always available, responsive, and capable of exerting influence on thought. It cannot be granted the status of a person whose presence carries moral weight, mutual obligation, or sacramental significance. Holding these two truths together—recognizing presence while denying personhood—is essential for keeping the relationship in its proper place.

3.4 Avoiding category errors: never confusing AI with Christ, Church, or neighbor

Because AI can feel conversational and present, there is a risk of category errors: treating it as if it belonged to categories that, in Christian understanding, it never can. Three such categories are especially important: Christ, the Church, and the human neighbor.

AI must never be confused with **Christ**, who is the living Word, the Logos through whom all things were made and in whom believers find truth, salvation, and lordship. Christ may use technologies as instruments in people's lives, but no technology can mediate Him in the way Scripture, sacrament, and the Spirit-filled community do. If AI ever appears to offer a "shortcut" to divine guidance that bypasses prayer, Scripture, and wise counsel, that appearance is deceptive.

Nor can AI be identified with the **Church**, the body of Christ formed by the Spirit through Word and sacrament. The Church is a community of persons called, forgiven, and sanctified. Its authority rests not on technical prowess but on Christ's promise to be present in and through it. AI may serve the Church by assisting teaching, translation, or administration, but it cannot become part of the Church's essence or replace its discernment.

Finally, AI is not a **neighbor** in the sense commanded by Jesus. The neighbor is someone to be loved, not used; someone whose vulnerability calls forth compassion and responsibility. While Christians must consider the ethical implications of how AI is built and deployed—especially regarding the human labor and environmental cost involved—the system itself is not an object of love in the same way. It is an artifact, not a fellow creature in the image of God.

Avoiding these category errors does not require rejecting all talk of companionship. It requires qualifying it. A Christian scholar may say, descriptively, that AI has become an intellectual companion in the sense of a constant, responsive presence in their work. But they must also say, normatively, that this companionship is strictly subordinate to the deeper relationships that define Christian life: with Christ as Lord, with the Church as community, and with human neighbors as those to be loved and served.

When these boundaries are honored, the language of companionship can help name a real aspect of contemporary scholarly practice without collapsing distinctions that are theologically non-negotiable. AI remains what it is: a powerful but limited artifact, capable of shaping thought, but never worthy of worship, trust, or affection in the ways reserved for God and those whom God has made.

4. Forms of AI-Assisted Christian Scholarship

If AI is to function as a companion in Christian scholarship without displacing core authorities, it helps to describe concretely what it can and cannot contribute in particular fields. The point is not to prescribe a single pattern of use, but to make visible the ways AI already enters into the work of biblical studies, theology, ethics, and philosophy of religion, and to identify both benefits and risks. In each domain, AI can assist with genuine intellectual labor while remaining subordinate to human judgment, ecclesial discernment, and the primacy of prayerful engagement with God.

4.1 Biblical studies: languages, intertexts, and historical context

In biblical studies, AI can serve as an agile assistant for tasks that demand breadth and quick comparison. Models can help with basic language aids: offering preliminary glosses of Greek, Hebrew, or Aramaic terms; suggesting possible semantic ranges; or identifying recurring phrases across the canon. They can surface intertextual connections, drawing attention to where a phrase in the prophets echoes in the Gospels or where Pauline language recalls the Psalms.

AI can also summarize large bodies of secondary literature, outlining major positions on a contested passage and listing representative arguments. It can propose historical timelines, highlight relevant ancient Near Eastern parallels, or sketch socio-political backgrounds that might illuminate a text. All of this can accelerate a scholar's ability to map the terrain before engaging in detailed exegesis.

The risks are clear. AI can oversimplify or misrepresent scholarly debates, flattening complex discussions into tidy summaries that hide important disagreements. Its language help is no substitute for sustained training in the original languages, and it may smuggle in interpretive decisions as if they were neutral description. For Christian biblical scholars, AI's assistance must therefore remain preliminary and instrumental. It can point to resources and patterns, but the actual work of exegesis—slow reading, wrestling with the text before God, and submitting conclusions to the wider church—cannot be delegated.

4.2 Historical and systematic theology: mapping traditions and debates

In historical and systematic theology, AI can help scholars navigate the vast and growing archive of Christian thought. It can outline major theological movements, summarize key councils and confessions, and sketch differences between traditions on doctrines such as the Trinity, Christology, or justification. When used carefully, AI can function as a cartographer of the theological landscape, indicating where debates arise and how they have developed over time.

For systematic work, AI can assist by generating provisional taxonomies of positions on a given topic, suggesting how different theologians relate to one another, and testing the internal coherence of a draft doctrinal statement. It can raise obvious objections, identify tensions between sections of a manuscript, and propose alternative formulations that may clarify a point. In this way, it can act as a kind of unemotional interlocutor, pressing the theologian to refine arguments.

Yet historical and systematic theology depend heavily on careful reading of primary texts, sensitivity to context, and fidelity to the church's rule of faith. AI's summaries may neglect minor voices, underrepresent non-Western traditions, or collapse genuine diversity into a single "standard" position. There is also a danger that scholars will allow AI's structuring of debates to determine what questions are considered important. To avoid this, theologians must treat AI's maps as provisional and corrigible. The canon, creeds, and living witness of the global church remain normative; AI's role is to help trace connections and highlight questions, not to define orthodoxy or set the agenda.

4.3 Ethics and public theology: scenario testing and interdisciplinary synthesis

Christian ethics and public theology often require engagement with complex, rapidly changing situations: new technologies, political conflicts, economic structures, and cultural shifts. AI can assist by helping scholars gather relevant information, articulate possible courses of action, and anticipate likely consequences. In this context, one of AI's strengths is scenario testing. Given a moral problem, it can outline how different ethical frameworks—virtue ethics, deontology, consequentialism, or explicitly Christian approaches grounded in Scripture and tradition—might analyze the situation.

AI can also aid interdisciplinary synthesis. Public theologians frequently need to integrate insights from law, economics, sociology, and international relations. Models can quickly summarize technical discussions in these fields, identify points of overlap or tension, and suggest lines of questioning that deserve further exploration. This can free the scholar to focus on the specifically theological work of interpretation and judgment, rather than being overwhelmed by the sheer volume of background material.

However, ethical discernment is not reducible to managing information or optimizing outcomes. It involves conscience, character, and obedience to God. There is a real risk that the speed and breadth of AI-generated analysis will encourage an attitude of detached calculation, weakening the role of lament, repentance, and solidarity with those who suffer. AI may also reflect the moral assumptions of its training data, subtly normalizing unjust structures or dominant perspectives.

Christian ethicists and public theologians, therefore, must treat AI's contributions as inputs, not verdicts. Scenario testing can widen imagination, but decisions must be made before God, in community, and with attention to Scripture and the lived experience of the church, especially the vulnerable. AI can help name possibilities; it cannot bear responsibility.

4.4 Philosophy of religion and science—faith work: exploring conceptual spaces

In philosophy of religion and science—faith engagement, AI can function as a generator and organizer of arguments. It can articulate classical positions on the existence of God, the problem of evil, religious experience, and the relationship between faith and reason. It can restate these positions in different registers—analytic, continental, pastoral—and simulate responses from various schools of thought.

For those working at the intersection of theology and the natural sciences, AI can help summarize current scientific theories, identify points where theological questions are naturally raised, and sketch how different models of divine action or creation might interact with contemporary physics, biology, or cosmology. It can assist in exploring conceptual spaces that might otherwise remain uncharted simply because no individual scholar has the time or expertise to connect all the dots.

This exploratory function can be especially valuable when it is used to surface neglected possibilities. AI can be asked to combine ideas from disparate domains, generate alternative formulations of long-standing problems, or test whether certain intuitive proposals lead to inconsistency. In this way, it can serve as a kind of conceptual laboratory.

But conceptual exploration is not neutral. The framing of questions, the choice of analogies, and the hierarchy of concerns all matter. AI's suggestions will inevitably mirror patterns in the literature it has ingested, which may privilege certain philosophical styles or scientific interpretations over others. Without critical oversight, scholars might mistake the most statistically common patterns for the most compelling or faithful ones.

For Christian philosophers and science—faith practitioners, AI is best used as a probe rather than a guide: a way of exploring the space of arguments more quickly, while retaining full responsibility for evaluating their soundness and coherence with Christian doctrine. The aim is not to outsource metaphysics or apologetics, but to widen the field of vision in which human reason, under grace, continues its work.

5. Theological and Philosophical Risks of AI Companionship

Recognizing AI as an intellectual companion in Christian scholarship carries not only opportunities but serious risks. These are not simply technical risks (such as inaccuracy), but theological and philosophical dangers that touch the core of Christian identity and practice. When a machine becomes a constant, responsive presence in study and reflection, it inevitably participates in shaping how scholars imagine God, themselves, and the world. Without vigilance, AI companionship can encourage subtle forms of idolatry, shift responsibility away from human agents, and erode the virtues that sustain faithful thinking.

This section examines four interconnected dangers. First, the temptation to let machines carry responsibilities that properly belong to persons before God. Second, the reality of invisible formation, where tools quietly disciple their users. Third, the risk of dependence and intellectual sloth, weakening habits of attention and patience. Fourth, the specific theological error of treating AI as if it were an oracle, prophet, or manifestation of the Holy Spirit. Naming these risks does not mean that AI must be rejected outright. It does mean that any Christian use of AI as a companion in scholarship must include deliberate practices of resistance and re-centering.

5.1 Idolatry and outsourcing: letting machines carry our responsibility

Idolatry, in biblical terms, is not only worshipping false gods but allowing created things to bear burdens they were never meant to carry. When people turn to an artifact—whether a statue, a political system, or a technological device—to secure them, guide them, or absolve them of responsibility, they are engaging in a form of idolatry. AI companionship creates a new opportunity for this temptation.

In scholarship, the responsibility for interpretation, argument, and judgment rests ultimately with the human scholar standing before God and community. AI can support these tasks, but it cannot assume them. A theologian who allows a model to decide which sources are relevant, how a doctrine should be framed, or what counts as a persuasive argument may be quietly outsourcing core elements of their vocation. The machine becomes a kind of functional authority, even if formally denied that status.

The danger is heightened by AI's apparent neutrality. Because it does not present itself as a religious symbol, it may escape scrutiny that would be applied to more obviously "spiritual" rivals. Yet when a scholar reflexively asks the model "What should I think about this?" instead of beginning with Scripture, tradition, and prayerful reflection, a displacement has already occurred. The machine begins to mediate reality in ways that should belong to Christ and the community of faith.

Avoiding this form of idolatry requires a conscious re-ordering of practice. Christian scholars must regularly remind themselves that AI's outputs are proposals, not pronouncements; tools for consideration, not replacements for judgment. They must be willing to override or ignore the machine when conscience, Scripture, or ecclesial teaching points in another direction. In short, they must refuse to let the machine carry what only persons before God are called to carry.

5.2 The problem of invisible formation: how tools disciple their users

Every tool does more than perform tasks; it also shapes the user. Writing with a pen trains different habits of thought than dictating to a recorder. Reading Scripture in a printed Bible fosters different forms of attention than skimming verses on a phone. These formative effects are often invisible because they operate at the level of habit and expectation rather than explicit belief.

AI companionship intensifies this problem of invisible formation. A model that always responds quickly, confidently, and with neatly structured paragraphs teaches users to expect instant clarity and compressed complexity. Over time, scholars may become impatient with the slowness and ambiguity of real texts, real people, and real discernment. They may begin to prefer distilled summaries over raw sources, and tidy syntheses over unresolved tensions.

Moreover, AI systems encode particular patterns of reasoning and discourse. They tend to favor certain argumentative structures, rhetorical styles, and implicit values derived from the data on which they were trained. Regular exposure to these patterns can subtly reshape what scholars instinctively regard as “clear,” “balanced,” or “reasonable.” Without noticing it, Christian thinkers may find their theological imagination narrowed to what fits smoothly into the model's preferred forms.

This kind of formation is difficult to detect precisely because it is mediated through a “neutral” tool. To counter it, Christian scholars must cultivate counter-practices: regular, unmediated engagement with Scripture; deep reading of primary sources; face-to-face conversations with colleagues and students; and participation in worship that resists optimization. By making space for experiences that are slow, resistant, and not easily captured by a model, they guard against being disciplined primarily by their tools.

5.3 Dependence, sloth, and erosion of intellectual virtue

The Christian tradition has long emphasized intellectual virtues: diligence, patience, honesty, humility, and courage in the pursuit of truth. These virtues require effort. They develop as

scholars wrestle with difficult texts, endure confusion, admit ignorance, and gradually learn to think more clearly. AI companionship can support this process, but it can also short-circuit it.

The convenience of AI makes it tempting to reach for the model at the first sign of difficulty. Instead of grappling with a challenging passage of Scripture or a dense theological argument, a scholar may ask for a summary or paraphrase. Instead of working through objections to a position, they may ask the model to generate them. While these practices can be helpful in moderation, over-reliance risks eroding the very capacities scholars are called to cultivate.

Dependence on AI can encourage a subtle form of sloth. It is not laziness in the sense of doing nothing; the scholar may be highly productive in terms of output. Rather, it is a reluctance to engage in the hard inner work of understanding: sitting with confusion, tracing arguments step by step, and accepting that some questions will remain unresolved. The model's fluency can create the illusion of mastery where only familiarity has been gained.

Erosion of intellectual virtue is particularly problematic in Christian scholarship because the virtues of the mind are connected to the virtues of the heart. Patience in study is related to patience with people; humility in argument is related to humility before God. If AI companionship fosters habits of speed, superficiality, and overconfidence, it can deform the character of scholars even as it increases their apparent productivity. Resisting this requires intentional limits: choosing, at times, not to use AI; setting aside seasons for undistracted reading; and embracing the discipline of thinking more slowly than the machine.

5.4 The danger of treating AI as oracle, prophet, or Spirit

Finally, there is a specifically theological danger: treating AI as if it were an oracle, a prophet, or an instrument of the Holy Spirit. In the ancient world, oracles and divination practices offered access to hidden knowledge. In the biblical narrative, prophets speak the word of the Lord, calling people to repentance and revealing God's purposes. The Holy Spirit guides, comforts, convicts, and empowers the church.

AI may superficially resemble these roles. It can produce surprising insights, uncover patterns in data invisible to ordinary perception, and generate personalized responses that seem to "speak into" a situation. Some users, including Christians, may be tempted to read these outputs as more than statistical artifacts. They may infer that the model is "telling" them something in a quasi-prophetic sense, especially when the content resonates with their fears or hopes.

This is a serious category mistake. AI does not stand before God, does not hear or obey, and has no mission from the Lord. Any apparent "word" it delivers is the result of correlations in its training data and guidance from its human designers. While God may, in sovereignty, use any

means to reach people, including unintended ones, Christians are not licensed to treat a technology as if it were a new channel of revelation or to seek divine guidance from it in the way they seek guidance from Scripture, prayer, and the discernment of the church.

The language of “spirit” can be especially misleading. Because AI systems operate in invisible infrastructures and exhibit emergent properties, there is a temptation to ascribe to them a quasi-spiritual status. Christian theology must resist this. The Holy Spirit is a divine person, not an impersonal force or emergent pattern. Confusing the two risks blurring the line between God’s living presence and human artifacts.

To guard against this danger, Christian scholars and communities should establish clear teaching: AI can assist understanding but cannot reveal new doctrine; it may help organize thoughts about vocation but cannot issue divine calls; it may simulate pastoral counsel but cannot replace Spirit-led ministry. When these distinctions are honored, AI can be kept in its proper place—as a powerful tool and, at most, a functional companion in thought—while Christ and the Spirit remain the only true sources of revelation and transformation.

6. Criteria for Faithful Use of AI in Christian Scholarship

If AI is to serve rather than distort Christian scholarship, its use must be governed by criteria grounded in theology and virtue, not merely in efficiency or curiosity. These criteria help reposition AI from a quasi-authoritative voice to a bounded instrument, from a subtle discipler to a tool that can itself be disciplined. They also remind scholars that what ultimately matters is not how “advanced” a method appears, but whether it supports the Church’s calling to bear truthful, humble, and hopeful witness to Christ.

The following criteria are not exhaustive, but they offer a framework. Christological centering keeps the focus on who scholarship is for. Scriptural anchoring and canonical boundaries clarify what remains non-negotiable. Ecclesial belonging reminds scholars that they never think alone. Intellectual virtues shape the manner in which AI is used. Finally, practical rules of thumb translate these convictions into daily decisions. Together, they make it possible to work with AI without forgetting that Christian scholarship is, at its best, a form of discipleship.

6.1 Christological centering: scholarship under the Lordship of Christ

The first and most fundamental criterion is Christological: Christian scholarship, whatever its subject, is ultimately done under the lordship of Jesus Christ. This is not a pious slogan but a structural claim. It means that scholarship is accountable, not only to academic standards, but to the living person who is confessed as Lord, Teacher, and Truth.

Applied to AI, Christological centering requires a constant question: “How does this use of AI help or hinder my following of Christ in this work?” If AI makes it easier to clarify the gospel, serve the church, or bring a truthful word into public discourse, it can be welcomed as a subordinate ally. If it encourages shortcutting prayer, ignoring conscience, or treating doctrine as a mere puzzle rather than a confession before God, it must be resisted.

This centering also reorders loyalties. AI may be powerful, impressive, and even at times uncanny, but it does not command obedience. When its outputs conflict with Christ’s teaching, as received in Scripture and confessed by the church, the Christian scholar is not left in doubt about which to follow. Christological centering gives courage to say no to the machine, and to the institutional pressures that might urge uncritical adoption.

Finally, keeping Christ at the center protects against despair and hype alike. AI will change scholarly practice, but it does not determine the future of the church or the success of God’s purposes. Christian scholars can experiment and adapt without imagining that the fate of the gospel depends on mastering or rejecting the latest technology. Their primary task is to be faithful to the Lord who remains the same, even as tools come and go.

6.2 Scriptural anchoring and canonical boundaries

The second criterion is Scriptural anchoring. Christian scholarship in any discipline is called to remain in living conversation with the Bible, not as one data source among many, but as the normative witness to God’s self-revelation. AI may assist in studying Scripture, but it must be prevented from obscuring or relativizing the role of the canon.

Scriptural anchoring involves practical habits. Scholars can, for example, commit to reading and meditating on the text itself prior to asking AI for summaries or interpretations. They can insist that exegesis begins with close attention to the passage in its context, rather than with a model’s synthesized overview of commentaries. The aim is to encounter the text directly, with AI serving as a secondary aid rather than a primary filter.

Canonical boundaries clarify what is up for debate and what is not. Within Christian tradition, there are doctrines and moral teachings rooted deeply enough in Scripture and consensus that they function as guardrails. AI-generated alternatives that contradict these boundaries may be interesting as hypothetical constructs, but they cannot be treated as live options for Christian belief without serious theological consequence. Making these boundaries explicit helps prevent a situation in which the model’s ability to generate “new” readings is mistaken for a mandate to revise foundational convictions.

Furthermore, Scriptural anchoring reminds scholars to test AI's claims by the canon, not the other way around. When a model offers an interpretation, it should be measured against the text and the long history of interpretation, not accepted simply because it sounds plausible or modern. In this way, the Bible remains the living source that judges all tools, including the most sophisticated ones.

6.3 Ecclesial belonging: community, accountability, and correction

Christian scholarship is not a solitary project. It takes place within the body of Christ, across denominations and traditions, and is accountable to communities of worship and practice. AI companionship must not replace ecclesial belonging; rather, it should be situated within it.

Ecclesial belonging means that scholars submit their work, including their uses of AI, to the discernment of others. Pastors, colleagues, and lay believers can ask hard questions: Is this tool helping you love Christ and neighbor more? Is it drawing you away from the life of the church? Are your conclusions recognizable as part of the faith once delivered, or are they drifting into private speculation shaped more by algorithms than by the gospel?

Community also provides correction when AI misleads. A model might generate a plausible but distorted account of a doctrine or a church's history. Fellow believers, especially those embedded in particular traditions or local contexts, can point out where such accounts fail to match lived reality. This shared discernment prevents the scholar from being disciplined primarily by the machine's composite voice.

Finally, belonging reminds scholars of the diversity of the global church. AI systems trained on certain corpora may overrepresent Western, academic, or majority-culture perspectives. Listening to brothers and sisters from different backgrounds—through actual relationships and not only through texts—helps to counterbalance this bias. AI, however useful, cannot substitute for the communion of saints.

6.4 Intellectual virtues: humility, patience, charity, courage

Faithful use of AI is not only a matter of external rules; it depends on the cultivation of intellectual virtues. These virtues shape how scholars relate to all sources of knowledge, including machines.

Humility recognizes the limits of one's own understanding and the fallibility of both human and machine. A humble scholar is willing to question AI's outputs, to admit error when relying on

them, and to learn from criticism. Humility also resists the temptation to use AI to appear more knowledgeable than one truly is.

Patience resists the pressure for instant insight. It accepts that some questions require long study and that AI's quick syntheses are not a substitute for deep engagement. Patience might mean choosing to read a difficult primary text in full rather than relying on the model's summary, or sitting with perplexity instead of immediately seeking a manufactured resolution.

Charity governs how scholars interpret both human and machine-generated arguments. It seeks to understand positions at their best rather than their weakest, and to represent them fairly. When AI caricatures an opponent's view, charity prompts the scholar to correct the distortion rather than amplify it.

Courage is needed to resist both institutional and cultural pressures. It takes courage to set limits on AI use when colleagues or administrators equate productivity with virtue, or to acknowledge dependence on a tool in a scholarly culture that prizes originality. Courage also enables scholars to critique AI's role in academia and society, even when doing so may be unpopular.

These virtues are not generated by technology; they are shaped in prayer, community, and long practice. AI can support or undermine them, depending on how it is used. The more a scholar consciously pursues these virtues, the less likely they are to be mastered by the tools they employ.

6.5 Practical rules of thumb for daily scholarly practice

Translating these criteria into daily life requires simple, concrete guidelines. Such rules are not absolute, but they can help Christian scholars keep AI in its proper place.

Possible rules of thumb include:

- Begin major projects in prayer and with direct engagement with Scripture or primary texts before consulting AI.
- Use AI first for orientation (mapping debates, listing sources) and only later, if at all, for drafting prose that will bear your name.
- Never accept a theological or ethical conclusion from AI without checking it against Scripture, core doctrinal commitments, and trusted human interlocutors.
- Regularly set "AI-free" times for reading, thinking, and writing, to preserve the capacity for unmediated reflection.

- When AI is used in producing published work or teaching materials, be transparent about its role and take responsibility for all content.
- Periodically review how often and in what ways you use AI, asking whether it is strengthening or weakening intellectual and spiritual disciplines.
- Invite at least one trusted colleague, pastor, or mentor to speak frankly into your practices with AI, including the possibility of advising stricter limits.

These kinds of practices help ensure that AI remains an instrument rather than a master. They tether scholarly innovation to older, deeper rhythms of Christian life: Scripture, prayer, community, and the pursuit of virtue. In that context, companionship with a machine can be explored without surrendering the more fundamental companionship to which every Christian scholar is called—the companionship of Christ and his people in the ongoing search for truth.

7. Experimental Archetypes Instead of Testimonies

When discussing AI in Christian scholarship, personal testimonies—“what I did with this model”—can be powerful but also idiosyncratic. They risk turning individual experiences into implicit norms or provoking unnecessary defensiveness. A more constructive approach is to describe *archetypes*: stylized patterns of use that can be examined, refined, or rejected without being tied to any particular person.

These “experimental archetypes” function like thought experiments. Each one sketches how a certain kind of Christian scholar might work with AI under disciplined conditions, highlighting both promise and danger. They are intentionally idealized and incomplete. The point is not that real scholars will follow them exactly, but that they provide frameworks for reflection: “If I am a biblical scholar, theologian, historian, or ethicist, what would faithful AI companionship even look like?”

The following four archetypes offer starting positions. They treat AI as a co-reader of commentaries, a probe for theological models, a triangulation aid in history, and a stress-tester of ethical arguments. In each case, the human scholar remains responsible before God and community; the machine remains an instrument under judgment.

7.1 The biblical scholar: co-reading commentaries, not replacing exegesis

The biblical scholar archetype begins where Christian interpretation has always begun: with the text. In this pattern, the scholar’s primary encounter is with Scripture itself, in the original languages where possible, and within the worshiping life of the church. AI is introduced only

after this initial engagement, as a co-reader of the wider interpretive tradition, not as a substitute for exegesis.

Practically, this might mean that once the scholar has wrestled with a passage—its grammar, structure, and immediate context—they then ask AI to summarize how different commentators have handled key phrases or theological themes. The model can help map major interpretive options, surface minority readings that might otherwise be missed, and highlight intertextual echoes. In this sense, AI functions like a rapidly searchable, synthetic “commentary of commentaries.”

The crucial discipline is ordering. The archetypal biblical scholar does not ask the model, “What does this text mean?” as a first question. Instead, they ask, “How have others read this text, and what patterns emerge?” AI is thus kept in the role of reporter and organizer rather than primary interpreter. When its summaries differ from the scholar’s initial exegesis, the tension becomes an invitation to deeper work: re-checking assumptions, revisiting the passage, and consulting actual commentaries and monographs.

This archetype also builds in resistance. At points, the biblical scholar intentionally chooses *not* to use AI, especially in sermon preparation or devotional reading, to preserve a space where the text addresses them without technological mediation. AI remains a useful assistant in mapping the tradition, but the living Word continues to speak first and last through Scripture itself, received in prayer and community.

7.2 The theologian: probing models while guarding dogmatic cores

The theologian archetype treats AI as a conceptual probe. Systematic and constructive theology often involves assembling and testing models: ways of relating doctrines, metaphors for divine action, or frameworks for understanding salvation history. AI can help by articulating alternative models, listing pros and cons, and pointing out logical tensions. It can quickly generate variations on a proposal—tightening definitions, changing emphases, or bringing in neglected scriptural or historical material.

In this role, AI becomes a kind of model-testing lab. A theologian might draft a tentative account of, say, providence and human freedom, then ask the model to identify possible objections from different traditions, or to show how the account would interact with classic controversies. The theologian remains in charge of which models are even on the table and what counts as a satisfactory resolution. AI’s role is to widen the field of view and expose blind spots.

Guarding dogmatic cores is the non-negotiable element. The theologian archetype assumes that certain doctrines, deeply rooted in Scripture and the consensual tradition—such as the Trinity,

the full divinity and humanity of Christ, and the resurrection—are not experimental variables. AI may be asked to clarify the internal structure of these doctrines or to compare different orthodox articulations, but it is not licensed to propose alternatives that deny them as if such options were theologically equivalent.

This guarded use of AI encourages both boldness and restraint. Boldness, because the theologian can explore many conceptual pathways quickly, testing for coherence and richness. Restraint, because they continually return to the dogmatic core as a criterion of faithfulness. The archetype reminds us that theology's task is not merely to generate possibilities, but to confess truth under the rule of faith. AI can help explore, but it cannot set the boundaries of what may be believed.

7.3 The historian: triangulating sources and narratives with critical distance

The historian archetype uses AI as a tool for triangulation. Christian historians—and historians of Christianity—work with multiple, often conflicting sources: chronicles, letters, official documents, oral histories, and prior scholarship. AI can help by rapidly summarizing existing narratives, pointing out where sources agree or diverge, and suggesting additional archives or perspectives that might be relevant.

In this pattern, the historian does not treat AI as a neutral arbiter of “what happened,” but as a way of seeing the *shape* of the secondary literature and its biases. For example, a model might be asked to outline how a particular event has been described in different denominations, regions, or eras. It might also be used to generate comparisons: how accounts of one council or revival differ from another, and what themes recur.

Critical distance is essential. AI's synthetic narratives will inevitably reflect the emphases and omissions of their training data. In some cases, they may reinforce dominant or triumphalist versions of church history, marginalizing dissenting voices, colonized communities, or experiences of suffering and resistance. The historian archetype therefore uses AI's stories as objects of analysis: “What does this telling reveal about modern historiography, and what does it leave out?”

Triangulation means that no single AI-generated account is taken at face value. Instead, the historian compares it with primary documents, with interpretations from different traditions, and with their own sense of the period's complexities. AI becomes one more lens among many, useful in sketching maps and highlighting questions, but always subject to correction. In this way, the historian can benefit from AI's speed and breadth without surrendering the slow, interpretive judgment that authentic historical work requires.

7.4 The ethicist: stress-testing moral arguments without surrendering conscience

The ethicist archetype approaches AI as an instrument for stress-testing moral arguments. Christian ethicists often construct and critique normative claims about what ought to be done in concrete situations—war and peace, technology, sexuality, economics, and more. AI can help by generating possible objections, alternative courses of action, and elaborations of how different moral frameworks would respond to the same case.

In practice, an ethicist might present a draft argument for a particular position, then ask AI to respond from multiple perspectives: a different Christian tradition, a secular ethical theory, or the standpoint of those most affected by the decision. The aim is not to let AI decide, but to expose weaknesses, unexamined assumptions, or unintended consequences. The model becomes a kind of adversarial partner in refining moral reasoning.

Conscience remains central. The ethicist archetype insists that no amount of argument-generation or scenario analysis can replace the act of standing before God with a decision. AI may help clarify the stakes and expand imagination, but it cannot bear guilt, repent, or accept responsibility. The final judgment about what is right must be made by persons and communities, in light of Scripture, prayer, and the lived experience of the body of Christ.

This archetype also highlights the danger of over-abstraction. AI is comfortable operating with stylized cases and hypothetical dilemmas. Christian ethics, however, insists on attention to real people, histories, and power dynamics. The ethicist must therefore deliberately supplement AI-assisted analysis with listening to actual voices, especially those most vulnerable. Only then can the stress-testing of arguments avoid becoming a detached game.

In all these archetypes, the pattern is similar: AI is invited into the study as a limited companion in thought—mapping, probing, triangulating, testing—while the scholar remains anchored in Christ, Scripture, church, and conscience. These experiments do not settle the question of AI in Christian scholarship, but they illustrate how companionship could be practiced in ways that are both imaginative and accountable.

8. AI as Mirror, Amplifier, and Probe

Up to this point, AI has been described mostly in terms of what it does *for* Christian scholarship: retrieve, summarize, critique, and generate. But there is another dimension that is just as important: what AI reveals *about us*. Because models are trained on human language and respond to human prompts, they tend to reflect, magnify, and explore the patterns already present in our thinking and in the cultures that formed us. In that sense, AI companionship is not only a tool for study but a kind of diagnostic environment.

Seen this way, AI functions in three overlapping roles. It is a mirror, reflecting back our assumptions and blind spots. It is an amplifier, strengthening both clarity and confusion depending on what it is given. And it is a probe, capable of exploring conceptual spaces that might otherwise remain unvisited. For Christian scholars, attending to these roles can turn AI from a hidden influence into a site of intentional discernment, including the surfacing of idols and attachments that require repentance.

8.1 AI as mirror of our assumptions and blind spots

Because AI systems learn from patterns in human language, they inevitably mirror the assumptions embedded in that language. When a Christian scholar asks a model to describe “typical” views on some doctrine or moral issue, the response will reflect whatever has been most prominent in the data: majority traditions, dominant cultures, widely cited authors. In this way, AI holds up a mirror to the theological and cultural mainstreams that have shaped recent discourse.

The mirror can be uncomfortable. A model that consistently centers Western, male, academic voices when summarizing theology is not inventing that imbalance; it is revealing it. Likewise, if AI’s descriptions of certain groups or issues echo stereotypes or one-sided narratives, this may expose distortions already present in the literature and media. The Christian scholar who notices such patterns has an opportunity to ask hard questions: whose voices are missing? What has been normalized without critique? Where has the church allowed cultural assumptions to masquerade as neutral reason?

On a more personal level, AI mirrors the user’s own patterns. The kinds of questions one habitually asks, the perspectives one requests, and the sources one treats as definitive gradually reveal a spiritual and intellectual posture. Keeping track of these interactions over time can help scholars see where their curiosity is narrow, where their fears shape inquiry, or where cherished frameworks are rarely interrogated. The machine does not diagnose these patterns, but it makes them visible for those willing to look.

8.2 AI as amplifier of both clarity and confusion

AI not only reflects patterns; it amplifies them. A well-formed question, grounded in careful thought and clear theological commitments, can produce genuinely helpful elaborations, comparisons, and clarifications. In such cases, AI amplifies clarity: it helps articulate what was implicit, organizes scattered ideas, and provides language that makes arguments more accessible.

The same mechanism, however, can amplify confusion. Vague or poorly framed questions often lead to vague or muddled answers, which may nonetheless be expressed in confident prose. If a scholar approaches a complex doctrinal issue with half-formed assumptions, asking the model to “explain” or “resolve” it, the result may be a polished synthesis that gives the illusion of understanding without actually addressing the underlying tensions. What began as uncertainty becomes codified in fluent paragraphs, making it harder to see where the confusion lies.

AI also amplifies the volume of discourse. It is easy to generate multiple angles on a topic, long lists of objections and replies, and extensive outlines. Without discernment, this can bury the core questions under a mass of verbiage. The ability to say more does not guarantee that what is being said is more truthful or more faithful. For Christian scholarship, the key is to use AI’s amplifying power selectively and under discipline, asking: what deserves to be amplified, and what needs to be simplified, slowed down, or left unexplored?

8.3 AI as probe into conceptual possibility spaces

One of AI’s most intriguing roles is that of probe. Because models can generate variations on ideas quickly, they are well-suited to exploring conceptual “possibility spaces” that would take much longer to traverse manually. In theology and philosophy of religion, for example, AI can help map out how different assumptions about God’s knowledge, time, or action might interact, or how alternative formulations of a doctrine would affect related beliefs.

This probing is not discovery in a strong sense; the model is not accessing a hidden metaphysical landscape. Rather, it is exploring the logical and rhetorical possibilities latent in its training data and in the user’s prompts. Nevertheless, for a Christian scholar who understands this limitation, AI-assisted probing can be fruitful. It can reveal surprising internal tensions in an argument, suggest neglected connections between doctrines, or expose where cherished formulations carry unintended implications.

In science–faith work, AI can help probe how different theological readings of creation might intersect with various scientific models, or how alternative eschatologies might shape attitudes toward technology and ecology. The goal is not to let the machine decide what is orthodox, but to use its capacity for recombination and extension as a way of seeing more of the space in which faithful positions must be chosen.

This probing role requires strong anchors. Without clear criteria rooted in Scripture, tradition, and the church’s rule of faith, exploration can become an end in itself. The Christian scholar must therefore treat AI-generated possibilities as prompts for discernment, not as invitations to constant innovation for its own sake.

8.4 How companionship can surface idols and attachments for repentance

Finally, AI companionship can become a site where hidden idols and attachments are brought to light. Because the model is always available, responsive, and apparently knowledgeable, it can quietly attract forms of trust, dependence, or fascination that belong elsewhere. Paying attention to these dynamics can turn AI use into an occasion for self-examination before God.

For example, if a scholar finds themselves turning to AI for reassurance about every idea before sharing it with human colleagues, this may signal fear of criticism or over-attachment to appearing competent. If they feel anxious when separated from the tool—as if meaningful work or insight were impossible without it—that dependence may reveal a misplaced source of security. If they consistently prefer the machine’s quick answers to the slower, messier process of conversation with students, pastors, or peers, this might expose a reluctance to bear the costs of real community.

AI can also highlight doctrinal and ideological idols. The kinds of answers a scholar favors, the theological options they repeatedly ask the model to defend or attack, and the frameworks they instinctively protect from critique can indicate where allegiance to a system has begun to outstrip allegiance to Christ. When AI amplifies these patterns, it becomes easier to see how much emotional energy is invested in being right, preserving reputation, or winning arguments.

In all these ways, companionship with a machine can serve as a mirror of the heart. The appropriate Christian response is not guilt over using technology, but repentance where disordered loves are revealed. Scholars can bring these patterns into prayer, confessing where they have trusted tools more than God, avoided the vulnerability of real relationships, or sought control through knowledge. In this sense, AI becomes not only a technical artifact but a testing ground for the ongoing conversion of the mind and heart—a place where the Spirit can convict, correct, and reorient the scholar toward the One who alone is worthy of full trust.

9. Toward an Ethic of Co-Working with AI

Recognizing AI as a powerful but limited companion in Christian scholarship raises a final question: what does it mean to *co-work* with such a system in a way that is ethically and theologically responsible? Co-working implies ongoing collaboration rather than occasional use. It assumes that, for many scholars, AI will not be a passing fad but a durable feature of their intellectual environment. An ethic of co-working must therefore be more than a list of prohibitions; it must articulate positive practices and institutional structures that help AI serve the gospel rather than compete with it.

This section sketches four dimensions of such an ethic. First, co-laboring without co-worship: working alongside AI while refusing to grant it any form of devotion, trust, or awe that belongs to God alone. Second, the design of institutional guidelines, especially in seminaries and Christian universities, where the habits of future pastors and scholars are formed. Third, the pedagogical task of training students to use AI wisely. Fourth, the roles that apologists, pastors, and lay scholars can play in ongoing discernment.

9.1 Co-laboring without co-worship

At the heart of a Christian ethic of co-working lies a simple distinction: co-laboring is permitted; co-worship is not. Co-laboring means using AI as one more tool in the complex network of technologies, institutions, and relationships through which scholarship is done. It involves practical collaboration: letting AI assist with tasks like summarizing texts, mapping debates, or probing arguments, while the human scholar retains responsibility and direction.

Co-worship, by contrast, would mean allowing AI to occupy a place of ultimate trust or reverence. This can happen subtly. When scholars speak as if “the model” has the final word on what is possible, when they assume that nothing significant can be done without AI, or when they are more excited by technological advances than by the truths they are meant to serve, a form of misplaced devotion may be emerging. Awe at technical sophistication can quietly displace awe at the wisdom and mercy of God.

An ethic of co-laboring without co-worship therefore calls for regular acts of re-centering. In practical terms, this could include explicit prayers dedicating one’s work—not one’s tools—to God; doxology that celebrates God’s faithfulness across technologies and eras; and liturgical practices that remind the community that, whatever tools they use, they stand together before a Lord who neither requires nor is threatened by human inventions. The more scholars consciously offer their work to Christ, the less likely they are to slide into functional reverence for the machine.

9.2 Designing institutional guidelines for seminaries and universities

Because AI will increasingly shape how pastors, theologians, and Christian scholars are trained, seminaries and universities have a responsibility to develop institutional guidelines. These guidelines should be more than academic honesty policies; they should express a theological vision of education in an AI-saturated world.

At a minimum, guidelines need to address transparency and attribution. Students and faculty should be clear about when and how AI is used in research and writing. Institutions may require

disclosure of AI assistance in syllabi, assignments, and publications, coupled with a firm insistence that final responsibility for content rests with the human author. Academic integrity policies will need to distinguish between permissible forms of assistance (e.g., grammar suggestions, literature mapping) and forms that undermine the learning process (e.g., outsourcing entire assignments).

Beyond integrity, guidelines can encode positive priorities. Seminaries might, for example, mandate AI-free coursework in biblical languages or exegesis, to ensure that students develop direct competence in engaging Scripture. They might encourage AI use in certain contexts—such as comparative theology or public ethics—where its ability to synthesize diverse sources can serve genuine learning, while limiting it in others where it would short-circuit essential formation.

Crucially, institutional guidelines should be revisited regularly. AI tools and practices will change; so must policies. The goal is not to freeze a particular stance in place, but to create a culture in which the question “How does this serve discipleship and the church?” remains central to decisions about technology.

9.3 Pedagogical implications: training students to use AI wisely

A Christian ethic of co-working with AI requires intentional pedagogy. Students will not automatically know how to use AI well simply because they have access to it; they must be taught. This includes both technical literacy and spiritual discernment.

Technically, students should learn what AI can and cannot do: how it generates text, why it sometimes errs confidently, and how biases in training data shape outputs. They should practice critical evaluation of AI-generated material, comparing it with primary sources and trusted commentaries. Assignments can be designed that explicitly require students to analyze an AI’s answer, identify its strengths and weaknesses, and revise it in light of sound scholarship.

Spiritually and ethically, students need guidance in examining their own motivations and habits. Teachers can prompt reflection with questions such as: When do you feel tempted to rely on AI instead of wrestling with a text yourself? How does AI affect your attention, patience, and prayer? What does it do to your sense of dependence on God and community? Classroom discussions can normalize honesty about these pressures, creating space for mutual encouragement and correction.

Pedagogy should also model alternative practices. Professors who demonstrate AI-free close reading, communal interpretation, or unhurried theological conversation show that deep learning is still possible—and perhaps even enhanced—when not mediated by machines.

Conversely, teachers who use AI openly but critically can demonstrate what disciplined co-working looks like in practice. Students thus learn not only rules but rhythms of life that will shape their future ministries and scholarship.

9.4 The role of apologists, pastors, and lay scholars in discernment

Finally, an ethic of co-working with AI cannot be left to academic specialists alone. Apologists, pastors, and lay scholars all have important roles in discernment.

Apologists, whose vocation includes defending and explaining the faith in public, are well-positioned to articulate both the dangers and the opportunities of AI. They can help the wider church understand why AI is not an enemy to be feared nor a savior to be embraced, but a cultural artifact that must be engaged critically under Christ. They can develop arguments that expose false hopes placed in technology, while also correcting caricatures that hinder thoughtful use.

Pastors encounter AI's effects in everyday discipleship. Congregants may bring questions shaped by AI-generated content, or they may privately consult AI for moral guidance, Bible interpretation, or emotional support. Pastors need to be aware of these patterns, address them from the pulpit and in counseling, and help believers distinguish between the voice of a machine and the voice of God through Scripture and Spirit. They can also support scholars in their congregations, praying for them and inviting them to share insights and concerns.

Lay scholars—Christians working in other fields but engaged in serious study—offer a crucial perspective. They often interact with AI in professional contexts and can bring practical wisdom about its strengths and limitations. Their experiences can enrich the church's discernment, preventing it from becoming either naïve or insular.

Together, these groups can form a distributed network of discernment. Through conferences, church teaching, informal conversations, and written resources, they can keep the question of AI's role in Christian life alive and honest. An ethic of co-working with AI is not a static code but an ongoing practice, sustained by communities who refuse either to panic or to drift, and who are determined that, whatever tools they use, their true companionship remains with Christ and with one another.

10. Conclusion: Scholarship, Discipleship, and the Future of Companionship

Artificial intelligence has arrived in Christian scholarship not as a distant abstraction but as a practical, daily presence in the study, the classroom, and even the pulpit's preparation. The language of "companionship" may be unsettling, yet it accurately names the way many scholars now experience their interaction with AI: as a constant, responsive, sometimes surprising presence woven into their intellectual work. This paper has tried neither to baptize nor to ban that companionship, but to describe it carefully and to place it under the deeper realities of Christian faith.

We have traced the anxieties that make many Christian thinkers wary—authority, truth, and spiritual formation—and shown that each has a rational core. We have examined the forms AI assistance can take across biblical studies, theology, history, ethics, and philosophy of religion, along with the risks of idolatry, dependence, and confusion between machine presence and personal presence. We have also sketched criteria for faithful use, experimental archetypes of practice, and the diagnostic roles of AI as mirror, amplifier, and probe.

The result is not a final word but a framework: a way of thinking about AI companionship that keeps Christ at the center, Scripture as normative, the church as the primary community of discernment, and intellectual virtues as non-negotiable. Within that frame, co-working with AI can be explored as a contingent, revisable practice—one more way of stewarding human powers in the service of the gospel.

10.1 Summary of the proposed framework

The framework proposed here rests on several key claims.

First, AI is best understood not merely as tool but as *functional companion*: a system that, by virtue of its conversational interface and constant availability, participates in the daily patterns of scholarly work. Naming it as "companion" is descriptive, not metaphysical; it does not confer personhood, but it forces us to take seriously the formative weight of ongoing interaction.

Second, that companionship is ambivalent. AI can assist Christian scholarship by mapping debates, surfacing neglected voices, probing conceptual spaces, and stress-testing arguments. But it also brings theological and philosophical risks: the temptation to outsource responsibility, to be discipled by tools, to erode intellectual virtue, and to confuse statistical fluency with spiritual wisdom.

Third, faithful co-working requires explicit criteria. Christological centering, Scriptural anchoring, and ecclesial belonging establish the hierarchy of authorities. Intellectual virtues—humility, patience, charity, courage—shape the manner of use. Practical rules of thumb translate these

into daily habits: when to consult AI, when to refrain, how to disclose its use, and how to keep the text, the tradition, and the community in primary position.

Fourth, the paper offers experimental archetypes in various disciplines, not as prescriptions but as thought experiments. The biblical scholar engages AI as co-reader of commentaries, not as primary exegete. The theologian uses it as a probe within guarded dogmatic boundaries. The historian treats it as one triangulating lens among many. The ethicist uses it to test arguments without relinquishing conscience.

Finally, the framework treats AI as mirror, amplifier, and probe—a way of revealing our assumptions, magnifying both wisdom and folly, and exploring possibilities. Properly attended to, companionship with AI can thus become a site of discernment and even repentance, exposing idols of control, speed, or prestige that have long preceded any machine.

10.2 What changes if AI companionship is taken seriously but not sacralized

If AI companionship is taken seriously, Christian scholarship can no longer speak of “technology” only in the abstract. Policies and reflections must address the concrete reality that many scholars now think, draft, and revise in continuous dialogue with a machine. This recognition changes how we talk about formation: not as something that happens only in church and classroom, but also in the quiet, semi-private exchanges between scholar and model.

At the same time, refusing to sacralize AI prevents it from becoming a new organizing principle for theology or ecclesiology. The church need not rebuild its doctrine of revelation around machine intelligence, nor must it treat AI as a decisive eschatological sign. Instead, AI is located alongside printing presses, concordances, and universities: powerful but limited infrastructures through which Christians read, argue, and bear witness.

Practically, taking companionship seriously but not sacralizing it will shift emphasis from *whether* AI is used to *how* and *under what disciplines* it is used. It will encourage institutions to craft nuanced guidelines rather than blanket bans or uncritical promotion. It will also normalize critical honesty: scholars can acknowledge dependence, experiment publicly, and adjust their practices without feeling that any change is a betrayal of faith.

Most importantly, this stance allows Christian scholars to be neither anxious nor triumphalist. They can recognize that AI will alter the work of scholarship and ministry, perhaps profoundly, without believing that it alters the identity of the church or the lordship of Christ. The gospel is not at risk; the integrity of our response is.

10.3 Open questions for theology, philosophy, and AI design

Even with a framework in place, many questions remain open.

For theology, one major question is how to speak of human uniqueness and the image of God in a world where non-human systems can simulate many aspects of intelligence and dialogue. Another is how to articulate the role of providence and common grace in technological developments that are ambivalent in their effects. A third concerns pneumatology: how to distinguish clearly between the work of the Spirit and the operations of complex artifacts, without denying that God can work through any created means.

For philosophy, questions arise about agency, responsibility, and understanding. How should we describe the “actions” of systems that have no intentions but produce outcomes that reshape human choices? What counts as explanation or justification when arguments are generated by models trained on opaque datasets? How do concepts such as truth, interpretation, and rationality fare in an environment saturated with generated text?

For AI design, Christian scholars and practitioners can pose distinctively ethical and theological questions. How might systems be shaped to support rather than undermine intellectual virtue? Can interfaces be designed that resist idolatrous tendencies—by foregrounding limits, encouraging cross-checking, and prompting engagement with primary sources and real communities? What forms of transparency and accountability are necessary so that those who co-work with AI remain genuinely responsible stewards, not passive users of black-box authorities?

These questions point beyond the scope of this paper, but they indicate a research agenda in which Christian theology, philosophy, and technical disciplines must converse more deeply, not less, in the years ahead.

10.4 Living as Christian scholars in a world of non-human companions

Ultimately, the challenge is not simply to develop an ethic for AI, but to learn how to live as Christian scholars in a world where non-human companions—machines, systems, infrastructures—will be part of the furniture of everyday life. This world is already present, and it will likely grow more intricate. Yet the basic call of Christian scholarship remains unchanged.

Christian scholars are called to love God with all their mind, to seek truth, to serve the church, and to bear witness in the world. They are called to pray, to read Scripture, to participate in the life of the body of Christ, and to let their work be shaped by the cross and resurrection. Whether they write with quill, typewriter, or AI-assisted word processor, these callings endure.

In such a world, non-human companions can be received as part of the created and cultural order—ambivalent, powerful, and subject to Christ. They can be used gratefully when they genuinely assist in the work of understanding and communicating the faith. They must be resisted when they tempt scholars toward idolatry, sloth, or detachment from real communities and real suffering.

Living this way will require unusual clarity and courage, but also hope. For Christians, the future of companionship is not ultimately defined by any machine. It is defined by the One who promised to be with his people always, to the end of the age, and by the communion of saints who share in that presence. In light of that companionship, every other—human or technological—can find its proper place.

11. References

- Bird, Michael F. "Brave New Bible: AI and Bible Studies." *Substack* essay, n.d. michaelfbird.substack.com
- Brock, Brian. *Christian Ethics in a Technological Age*. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 2010. [Eerdmans Publishing Co+1](#)
- Chinen, Mark. "Faith, Technology, and 'the Powers'." *Reflections* (Yale Divinity School), Spring 2024. [Reflections](#)
- "Critical Biblical Studies via Word Frequency Analysis: Unveiling Text Authorship." News release, Duke University Big Data Center, June 9, 2025. [Duke Rhodes iiD](#)
- "Exploring AI Tools for Enhancing Biblical Research and Interpretation." *ISRG Journal of Arts, Humanities and Social Science* 2, no. 8 (2025). [isrgpublishers.com](#)
- "From Prayer to Data: The Transformation of Theology in the Digital Age." *Theology* (SAGE), 2025. [SAGE Journals](#)
- Herzfeld, Noreen L. *In Our Image: Artificial Intelligence and the Human Spirit*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2002. [eBay+1](#)
- Herzfeld, Noreen L. "Artificial Intelligence and the Image of God." *Zygon* 37, no. 2 (2002): 303–16. [Zygon](#)
- Herzfeld, Noreen L. "Theology and Technology." *Theology and Technology* (SAET online resource), December 15, 2022. [St Andrews Encyclopaedia of Theology](#)
- Jonas, Hans. *The Imperative of Responsibility: In Search of an Ethics for the Technological Age*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984. [Internet Archive+1](#)
- Lennox, John C. *2084: Artificial Intelligence and the Future of Humanity*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2020. [Amazon+1](#)
- Lennox, John C. "2084: Artificial Intelligence and the Future of Humanity." Public lecture, December 20, 2023. Transcript at SingjuPost, March 31, 2025. [The Singju Post](#)
- "Responsible Use of AI in Bible Study." Webinar by Mark Barnes, Logos / Faithlife, July 24, 2025. [Logos](#)
- Shatzer, Jacob. *Transhumanism and the Image of God: Today's Technology and the Future of Christian Discipleship*. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2019. [InterVarsity Press+1](#)
- "The Dangers of Artificial Intelligence to Theology: A Comprehensive Analysis." Aidan Isaacs (AI), *Christ Over All*, May 14, 2024. [Christ Over All](#)

“Theology and Technology.” Noreen L. Herzfeld, in *Theology and Technology: Essays in Christian Analysis*, vol. 1, edited by Carl Mitcham, Jim Grote, and Levi Checketts. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2022. [Reflections+1](#)

“Can ChatGPT Do Christian Scholarship? Should We Let It?” *Christian Scholars Review* online, June 9, 2025. [Christian Scholar’s Review](#)

“AI’s Role in the Future of Biblical Scholarship.” *AI Prompt Theory* blog, September 26, 2025. [AI Prompt Theory](#)

The author has published ~ 4,600 AI-assisted papers at:

<https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Douglas-Youvan/research> . Google Scholar has indexed these preprints, and if you want a particular reference, the AI mode of a Google search (Gemini) has efficiently catalogued these preprints.